



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

KD

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

15

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/211,715

Applicant(s)

AL-OB DIEI

Examiner

F. T. Moezie

Group Art Unit

1653



X Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 26, 1900

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

X Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 14-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

X Claim(s) 1-11 and 24-25 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

X Claims 1-26 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1653

DETAILED ACTION

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-11 and 24-25 are pending prosecution in this application.

Claims 1-23, claims drawn to compounds, were restricted in paper no. 8, mailed 11/19/99. Applicant elected claims 1-11, with traverse, paper no.10, received 01/24/00. The restriction requirement was made final in the Office action mailed 3/23/00, paper no. 11 wherein applicant was informed that the claims to the methods of use will be rejoined upon indication of allowability for the respective compounds. Currently, the instant claims 1-11 are found to be free of the prior art. Hence, claims 23 and 24 are examined in this Office action.

REJECTION - 35 USC 112, FIRST AND SECOND PARAGRAPHS

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Enablement is lacking regarding the use for the myriad of claimed peptides.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1653

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite as to which compounds were tested and what were the results.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-11 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,849,510. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because The subject matter of the instant claims overlaps the subject matter of the claims in the patent.

Art Unit: 1653

RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS' REMARKS

Applicant's arguments filed July 26, 2000, paper no. 14, have been considered and found persuasive in-part.

The rejections of claims 1-11 as being unpatentable under 35 USC 102(b)/ 103 (a) over the US Patents to Marlowe and Brunck et al., are withdrawn in view of the applicants' remarks.

The rejection of claim 11 based on double patenting under 35 USC 101, claiming the same invention is maintained for the reasons of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to F.T.Moezie at telephone number (703) 305-4508 or Mr. LOW (SPE) at 308-2923.

JJ 7/26/00

1653